

**REMARKS**

Claims 13-34 stand rejected. Claims 1-12 had previously been canceled. Claims 13, 21, 23, 24, and 28-34 have been amended. New claims 35-53 have been added. The purpose of the amendment is to correct informalities and claim additional aspects of Applicant's invention. The amendment is supported throughout the original disclosure. No new matter has been added. Claims 13-53 are presently pending.

Reconsideration of the present application is requested in light of the amendment and the remarks given below.

**CLAIM OBJECTIONS**

The Examiner objected to claim 28. Applicant respectfully submits that the objection is moot in light of the present amendment and requests withdrawal of the objection.

**35 U.S.C. § 102 REJECTION OF CLAIMS 13-34**

Claims 13-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) in light of U.S. Patent 6,272,801 to Suh (hereinafter "Suh"). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection for at least the reasons given below.

Amended claim 13 recites

*a first temporary support adapted to prevent the engagement of the first and second interlocks when the frame assembly is transported prior to installation.*

Applicant respectfully submits that this feature is neither taught nor suggested by Suh, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection for at least this reason.

Claim 14-20 depend from claim 13, and thus should be allowable for at least the same reasons as claim 13.

Claim 21 has been amended to place it in independent form, incorporating the already existing limitations of its parent base claim, claim 13. Amended claim 21 recites

*the first interlock includes a pin and a ledge extending from the pin at a point outward from the base of the pin, the ledge facing outwardly from the first frame member*

This element is neither taught nor suggested in the cited Suh reference. The structures in Suh identified by the Examiner as ledges in the rejection of claim 21 are all located either at the base of the pin, or face towards rather than outward from the respective frame member. Because the cited reference lacks features recited in the claim, the Examiner has failed to make out a proper case of anticipation. For at least this reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claim 22 and 23 depend from claim 21, and thus should be patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 21.

Claim 24 has been amended to place it in independent form. The Examiner cited two separate structures in Suh as a single interlock in an attempt to meet the limitations of Applicant's claim 24. Applicant respectfully traverses, believing this to be contrary to the language of the claim. However, to expedite prosecution, Applicant has amended claim 24 in a manner which Applicant submits has not altered the scope of the claim, expressly reciting that the pair of pins are engageable by inserting them together in the second interlock. In contrast, the structures identified by the Examiner are inserted in separate interlocks. Suh neither teaches nor suggests the insertion of a pair

of pins in any sort of receiving mechanism as an approach for locking frame members together. For at least this reasons, Applicant respectfully submits that claim 24 is not anticipated by Suh, and respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection.

Claims 25-28 depends from claim 24 and should thus be patentable for at least the same reasons as claim 24.

Claims 29, 31, and 33 recite temporary support members similar to those recited in claim 13 and should be allowable for at least similar reasons.

Claim 30 and claim 32 have been amended to place them in independent form. Both claims recites the use of a pair of pins in the first interlock, the pair of pins being engageable by insertion in the double cleat. This structure is neither taught nor suggested by Suh. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections of claim 30 and 32 is respectfully requested.

Claim 34 has been amended to place it in independent form, and to clarify that the planar surface extends between the base ends of the double cleat. As discussed previously, this structure is neither taught nor suggested by Suh. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

#### **NEW CLAIMS 35-42**

New claims 35-39 depend from previously discussed claims. They therefore should be allowable for at least the same reasons as the claims from which they depend.

New claims 40-51 have been added to claim additional features of Applicant's invention. Independent claim 40 recites that the first and second frame members are identical. This feature is not believed to be present in the cited references. Claims 41-43 depend from claim 40 and should be patentable for at least similar reasons. Claim 44 similarly recites that the first frame member and the second frame member are configured to be formed from the same mold cavity. This feature is not believed to be present in the cited references. Claims 45-47 depend from claim 44 and should be patentable for at least similar reasons. Claim 48 recites that the first and second frame members both have interspersed first and second type screwless interlocks. This feature is not believed to be present in the cited references. Claims 49-53 depend from claim 48, and thus should be patentable for at least similar reasons.


**CONCLUSION**

All rejections and objection have been addressed. Reconsideration of the amended application and passage to allowance is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

KENYON & KENYON

Dated: Oct. 26, 2004

By:   
Andrew Reibman  
Reg. No. 47,893

KENYON & KENYON  
One Broadway  
New York, New York 10004  
(212)425-7200  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26646**